

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,008	01/11/2002	Reed J. Blau	1082-035	5219
60794 7590 08/03/2007 TRASKBRITT, P.C./ ALLIANT TECH SYSTEMS P.O. BOX 2550			EXAMINER	
			FELTON, AILEEN BAKER	
SALILAKE	CITY, UT 84110	Reed J. Blau 1082-035	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/046,008	BLAU, REED J.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Aileen B. Felton	1755				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tilt  will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 M	av 2007.					
· <u> </u>	action is non-final.					
· <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
•	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,10-14,16-25,68 and 69</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>11-14, 20,21,23-25,68 and 69</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,10,16-19 and 22</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	•				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  6) Other:						

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-8, 10, 16-19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wise et al (H72) in view of Cioffe (5,449,423), Weber (5,620,691), and Bell (4,570,540).

Wise discloses a substitute for black powder that comprises phenolthlein, sulfur, and potassium nitrate (see claims).

Cioffe teaches that it is known to use a mixture of oxidizers including potassium nitrate and potassium perchlorate of 35-69.5 % and of size 1-20 microns (col. 4 and 5). in a composition that is a substitute for black powder.

Weber teaches the use of PVA a vinyl acetate polymer in a composition that is a substitute for black powder and includes phenolphthalein and potassium nitrate.

Bell teaches that it is known to remove sulfur from a composition that is a substitute for black powder in order to reduce hazard properties relative to black powder (col. 2, lines 25-40).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a mixture of oxidizers as taught by Cioffe since Cioffe suggests that mixtures of oxidizers are useful in a composition that is a substitute for

Art Unit: 1755

black powder and also to use the binder as taught by Weber with the composition of Wise, since Weber teaches that it is a known binder to be used in a composition that is a substitute for black powder. The moisture uptake is an inherent property of the taught binder. As to limitations which are considered to be inherent in a reference, note the case law of In re Ludke, 169 USPQ 563; In re Swinehart, 169 USPQ 226, In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594; In re Best et al, 195 USPQ 430; and In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685, 688. It is also obvious to remove sulfur form a black powder substitute since Bell teaches that it is known to do so in order to reduce hazard properties relative to black powder.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aileen B. Felton whose telephone number is 571.272.6875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30-4:00, except alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571.272.1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,008

Art Unit: 1755

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AILEEN FELTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER